



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/780,308	02/09/2001	Fu-Tai Shih	10005922-1	6695
22879	7590	07/14/2004	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			BAYARD, DJENANE M	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2141		3
DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/780,308	SHIH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Djenane M Bayard	2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2001.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 3,4,7 and 8 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5 and 6 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2004/0103167 to Grooters et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 2003/0046361 to Kirsch et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,460 to Stewart et al.

1. As per claims 1 and 5, Grooters et al teaches an admissions control system for a host site comprising a trap that withholds from a request processor incomplete HTTP requests (See page 5, paragraph [0039]). However, Grooters et al fails to teach wherein the request is http request and retiring incomplete HTTP requests to avoid exceeding a storage limitation.

Kirsch et al teaches wherein the http request is incomplete and retires incomplete http request (See page 6, paragraph [0062]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the http request is incomplete and retires incomplete http request to avoid exceeding a storage limitation in order to return an error message to the client (See page 6, paragraph [0062]). However, Grooters et al in view of Kirsch et al fails to teach to avoid exceeding a storage limitation.

Stewart et al teaches a method and apparatus for efficient storage and retrieval of objects in and from an object storage device. Furthermore, Ferguson teaches to avoid exceeding a storage limitation (See col. 22, lines 4-11)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate to avoid exceeding a storage limitation as taught by Ferguson in the claimed invention of Grooters et al in view of Kirsch et al in order to keep a limit set on the utilization of the storage (See col. 22, lines 5-6).

2. As per claims 2 and 6, Grooters et al in view of Kirsch et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Grooters et al teaches wherein said trap sending requests to said deferral manager (See page 5, paragraph [0039]). However, Grooters et al teaches said deferral manager sending some of said complete HTTP requests to said request processor and responding with deferral messages to some others of said complete HTTP requests.

Kirsch et al teaches said deferral manager sending some of said complete HTTP requests to said request processor and responding with deferral messages to some others of said complete HTTP requests (See page 6, paragraph [0062]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate deferral manager sending some of said complete HTTP requests to said request processor and responding with deferral messages to some others of said complete HTTP requests in order to return an error message to the client (See page 6, paragraph [0062]).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-4 and 7-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M Bayard whose telephone number is (703) 305-6606. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Djenane Bayard

June 30, 2004



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER